



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/634,001	08/04/2003	Ming-Ching Chang	67,200-1107	5032

7590 04/11/2006

TUNG & ASSOCIATES  
Suite 120  
838 W. Long Lake Road  
Bloomfield Hills, MI 48302

EXAMINER
----------

GEORGE, PATRICIA ANN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1765

DATE MAILED: 04/11/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/634,001	CHANG ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Patricia A. George	1765	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 January 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)             | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)    | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____  |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Amendment***

Claims 1, 3, 7, 9, 14, 17, 19, and 23 have been amended to correct grammatical errors and further clarify applicants' invention. Applicants have amended claims 1, 9, 14, and 19 to overcome the rejection.

### ***Withdrawal of Rejections***

Applicant's common ownership statement is sufficient to withdrawal the previous 103 rejection.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1, 2, 4-9, 11-12, 14-19, and 21-22 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee of USPN 5,665,203 in view of Nallan et al. in 6,902,681.

As for independent claims 1 and 14, Lee et al. discloses a method of Reactive Ion Etching (RIE) of polysilicon gate structures for vertical sidewalls (col. 1, l. 6-7) that obtains accurate pattern transfer (col.6, l.39-40). Lee teaches a gate dielectric (fig. 4, 22 and col.3, l.35) formed over a silicon substrate (fig. 4, 21 or col.3, l.32) and a polysilicon layer (fig.4, 23 and col.3, l.36) formed over the gate dielectric; providing a hardmask layer (fig.4, 52 and col.4, l.11-12) over the polysilicon layer; using a photo resist layer (col.3, l.50) to pattern the hardmask layer for forming parallel N and P type polysilicon gates (fig.5, 12 &13) written on gate electrodes. Lee discloses a method of RIE that has three steps (col.4, l.28) and a typical over etch (col.4, l.57), which is written on four RIE etch steps. Lee discloses the first RIE step etches through any oxide that is formed on the polysilicon layer (col.4, l.32-32), written on etching on hardmask layer to expose the polysilicon layer. Lee discloses the second RIE step etches through all but 20 nm of polysilicon which is written on to etch through a first thickness portion of the polysilicon layer. Lee discloses a third RIE step that has a polysilicon to silicon oxide selectivity (col.4, l.52), which is written on etching through the second thickness portion of the polysilicon layer. Lee also discloses the bias power is at 50 watts (col.4, l.54), a lower setting than use for the second RIE step, 200 watts (col.4, l.41) (as in claims 5 and 15). Lee discloses an over etch that follows the third RIE step that is timed to reach the gate oxide (col.4, l.59), which is written on a fourth RIE etch process to etch through a remaining thickness of the polysilicon layer.

Lee does not disclose plasma treating the exposed gate dielectric and polysilicon layer in-situ wherein the plasma is formed essentially from an inert source gas to neutralize an electrical charge imbalance, as in claims 1 and 14.

Nallan et al. in 6,902,681 teaches plasma treating the gate dielectric, a high-k material (col.2, line 20-35), as in claim 11 and 21, and polysilicon layer in-situ (col. 2, lines 52-53), where the plasma is formed essentially of an inert gas source (col.5, line 2 shows ranges for gas including the option of 20 sccm Cl<sub>2</sub>, 2 sccm CO, and 200 sccm N<sub>2</sub>) (as in claims 6, and 16). Nallan et al. teaches the bias power may be pulsed at 0 and 300 watts (col. 3, l. 60-64), which illustrates zero RF bias as in claim 2.

Nallan et al. does not teach the treatment would "neutralize the electrical charge imbalance" as in claims 1 and 14. However, Nallan's treatment provides the process conditions claimed by applicant it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made, that Nallan's plasma treatment formed essentially of an inert gas source would have the same function as applicants' claimed invention because Nallan's plasma treatment provides the same process conditions claimed by applicant.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made, to include a plasma treatment step to the exposed gate dielectric and polysilicon layer in-situ wherein the plasma is formed essentially from an inert gas source to neutralize the electrical charge imbalance, as in applicants claims 1 and 14, when etching a polysilicon gate profile, as Schoenborn, because Nallan et al. teaches it is a process improvement because it does not expose the substrate to an oxidation

Art Unit: 1765

process which protects the polysilicon electrode and underlying silicon, avoiding making transistors defective or inoperable (see col.1, l.35-48), which would impart added benefits of fewer electrical defects, a higher yield, and cost savings.

As for claim 4, Lee illustrates in figure 2 (parts 28 and 30) that the polysilicon layer includes both n and p doped regions used to form doped polysilicon gate electrodes shown in parallel (col.3, l.42-46).

As for claims 7-8 and 17-18, Lee discloses the third and fourth RIEs are carried out with 45 sccm of HBr, 3 sccm (70%) of He, and 30% O<sub>2</sub>, which as claimed, is a chlorine-free etching chemistry comprising HBr and oxygen.

As for claims 9 and 19, Lee discloses a combination of HBr/Cl<sub>2</sub>/O<sub>2</sub> in the first and second etch steps (col.4, l.39-40 and c.4, l.46-50).

As for claims 11 and 21, Lee discloses the gate dielectric is thermally grown SiO<sub>2</sub> (col.3, l.33-34).

As for claims 12 and 22, Lee discloses the hardmask layer is LTO (col.3, l.53 and 55).

As for claims 5 and 15, Lee is silent on the topic of RF source power and does not reference it, including the lowering the source power in the third step.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

Claims 3, 10, 13, 20, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee and Nallan et al., as applied to claims 1, 2, 4-9, 11-12, 14-19, and 21-22 above, further in view of Lill et al. of USPN 6,284,665.

The combined invention of Lee teaches the benefits of self-bias and the benefit of reducing etching bias with an over etch step, but never discloses the RF bias is set to zero. Lee is also completely silent about RF frequency, or that it is adjustably decoupled.

Lill et al. teaches typical process conditions for RIE of polysilicon selectively to silicon nitride. Lill teaches the use of no-bias power to minimize the amount of self-bias on the substrate (col.10, l.15-30), as in claims 3, 13, and 23. Lill also teaches the RF bias power is supplied at the claimed frequency of greater than about 1 MHz (col.8, l.4) and in figure 2 Lill illustrates the RF bias power and is adjustably decoupled (col.10, l.4) from the RF source power, as in claims 10 and 20.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made, to use the typical process conditions for RIE of polysilicon selectively to silicon nitride, of Lill, when using the method of RIE for polysilicon gate structures, of Lee, because Lill teaches they are typical for RIE of polysilicon.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

Claims 1 – 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schoenborn in US 5,242,536 in view of Lee et al. in US 5,665,203 and Kim et al. in US 6,620,575 and Winniczek et al. in US 6,093,332 and Nallan et al. in 6,902,681.

Schoenborn discloses an improved method for controlling (i.e. improving) the profile of a polysilicon gate electrode in a polysilicon etch process (see section on invention background). Schoenborn discloses a method to etch a polysilicon profile (i.e. electrode) (col.3, lines 7-8), formed over an oxide gate (i.e. dielectric layer) (see abstract) formed over the substrate, a monocrystalline silicon wafer (col.3, lines 21-23). Schoenborn discloses it is common to place a resist material over the silicon layer (col.2, lines 13-15) and goes on to include oxide (which illustrates silicon oxide as in claim 12 and 22) a well known material used to obtain vertical profiles (i.e. hard mask) (col.1, lines 40-43 and col.2, l.24-26). Schoenborn discloses plasma etch (i.e. RIE) process are well known, and starts by discussing a beginning process (i.e. first step) to form masking patterns that are used to protect the areas of the wafer from the etch process, which illustrates a thickness of the mask layer has been removed to expose the polysilicon which will be etched to form a polysilicon gate electrode. Next, the second step, Schoenborn discloses is a silicon etch which uses minimal etching bias and low power for bulk polysilicon removal (col. 1-2, lines 38-2). And finally, a third step, a limited overetch cycle which selectively etches the poly to oxide which discloses a selectivity of poly:oxide, illustrating etching through a second thickness portion of the polysilicon layer to expose portions of the underlying gate dielectric



(col.4, lines 3-7). Schoenborn discloses Etching chemistry of HBr/Cl<sub>2</sub> and the presence of O<sub>2</sub> unavoidable, either through the intentional addition of O<sub>2</sub> or the presence in the chamber from leaks.

Schoenborn discloses doped polysilicon regions (col.2, 30-31), as in claim 14, but is silent as to how or what they are doped with, such as n-doped and p-doped, as in claim 14.

Lee et al., in US 5,665,203, discloses it is well known that a function of the polysilicon layer is to have both n and p type doped regions that form separate electrodes, as in claims 4 and 14 (see col.3, lines 59-67).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made, to include the doped regions of the polysilicon layer, of Schoenborn, are n-doped and p-doped, as in Lee, because Lee illustrates (see fig. 1-5) it is well known and functional for polysilicon to be doped.

Schoenborn does not teach the third and fourth RIE process steps are carried out with HBr and O<sub>2</sub>, (chlorine free) as applicants limitations of claims 7, 8, 17, and 18.

Lee et al. also teaches the RIEs process step are carried out with 45 sccm of HBr, 3 sccm (70%) of He, and 30% O<sub>2</sub>, which as claimed, is a chlorine-free etching chemistry comprising HBr and oxygen, as in claims 7, 8, 17, 18, and 19.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made, to use the chlorine free chemistry, of Lee, when etching the third

Art Unit: 1765

and fourth process RIE step, as in applicants' claims 7, 8, 17, 18, and 19, because Lee teaches it is effective.

Schoenborn discloses systems to use for polysilicon etching, which are commonly known to be configured for rf source and bias power. However Schoenborn is silent about rf source and bias power in the second step, as in claim 14 (See col.2, lines 47-55.) and that the bias power is about 1 Mhz adjustably decoupled from the rf source, as in claim 10 and 20.

Kim et al. in US 6,620,575 teaches polysilicon etch with rf power at both source and bias (see Table 1) and that the bias power is 1 Mhz adjustably decoupled from the rf source (col.7, l. 5-15), as in claim 10 and 20.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made, to include rf source and bias power, as Kim, when etching polysilicon in a system that is configured for rf source and bias power, as Schoenborn, for applicants' second etch step, because Kim teaches (see Figure 9) that CD bias is a function of plasma source and bias power and directly relates to the CD of the patterned masking material of built up structures which achieves advantageous physical bombardment of the surfaces contacted by the plasma, helpful to apply a bias to the patterned mask and underlying substrate.

Schoenborn does not disclose using lower etch power in the third step than in the second RIE step, the lower power selected from the group consisting of 1) a lower RF

Art Unit: 1765

source power, 2) a lower RF bias power, as in claims 1, 5, and 14 and Schoenborn is silent about zero rf bias in the overetch process which removes remaining portions of polysilicon., as in claims, 3, 13, 14, 15, and 23.

Winniczek et al. in US 6,093,332 teaches pulsing an RF power source at a predefined frequency to provide pulsed RF power to the chuck (see summary of invention), which illustrates zero rf power, while etching any masked material, to include polysilicon (col.3, line 47). Winniczek et al. teaches this masked pattern etch method has the benefit of reducing erosion of the mask due to polymer deposition on the mask, as in claims 3, 13, 14, 15, and 23.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made, to use the process of pulsed power, providing zero rf power to the chuck, as in Winniczek et al., when performing applicants' third and overetch step, because Winniczek teaches a benefit of reducing mask erosion through polymer deposition.

Schoenborn is silent as to plasma treating the exposed gate dielectric and polysilicon layer in-situ wherein the plasma is formed essentially from an inert gas source to neutralize the electrical charge imbalance, as in claims 1, 2, 6, 14, and 16; and the type of oxide the gate dielectric is, such as high-K as in claim 11 and 21.

Nallan et al. in 6,902,681 teaches plasma treating the gate dielectric, a high-k material (col.2, line 20-35), as in claim 11 and 21, and polysilicon layer in-situ (col. 2, lines 52-53), where the plasma is formed essentially of an inert gas source (col.5, line 2

Art Unit: 1765

shows ranges for gas including the option of 20 sccm Cl<sub>2</sub>, 2 sccm CO, and 200 sccm N<sub>2</sub>) (as in claims 6, and 16). Nallan et al. teaches the bias power may be pulsed at 0 and 300 watts (col. 3, l. 60-64), which illustrates zero RF bias as in claim 2.

Nallan et al. does not teach the treatment would “neutralize the electrical charge imbalance” as in claims 1 and 14. However, Nallan’s treatment provides the process conditions claimed by applicant it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made, that Nallan’s plasma treatment formed essentially of an inert gas source would have the same function as applicants’ claimed invention because Nallan’s plasma treatment provides the same process conditions claimed by applicant.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made, to include a plasma treatment step to the exposed gate dielectric and polysilicon layer in-situ wherein the plasma is formed essentially from an inert gas source to neutralize the electrical charge imbalance, as in applicants claims 1 and 14, when etching a polysilicon gate profile, as Schoenborn, because Nallan et al. teaches it is a process improvement because it does not expose the substrate to an oxidation process which protects the polysilicon electrode and underlying silicon, avoiding making transistors defective or inoperable (see col.1, l.35-48).

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicants assert, on page 14, the reference of Pan et al. is improper under 35 USC 103(c), as a result, the rejection is withdrawn and a new ground(s) of rejection, is presented above.

Applicant's attorney of record assert, on page 18, that the reference of Lill et al. use a low bias voltage. Examiner disagrees, as Lill explicitly teaches use of the use of no-bias power to etch polysilicon under typical process conditions for RIE of polysilicon selective to silicon nitride.

### ***Conclusion***

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

Referring to the reduction of plasma charge-induced damage in micro-fabricated devices see USPN 6,440,756.

Referring to a hardmask layer of silicon oxide, silicon nitride, and silicon oxynitride: USPN 6583063, USPN 6566264, and USPN 6194323.

Referring to zero RF power during RIE: USPN 5679606, USPN 6759337, USPN 6184158, USPN 6251792, and USPN 6143625.

Referring to RF bias power supplied at a frequency greater than 1 MHz: Table 1: Typical characteristics of low pressure plasmas used for reactive ion etching on page 198 of The Handbook of Plasma Processing Technology - Fundamentals, Etching,

Art Unit: 1765

Deposition, and Surface Interactions, edited by Rossnagel et al, shows typical RF bias power is supplied at a frequency of 10 kHz – 27 MHz, also see USPN 6372654.

Referring to gate dielectrics of thermally grown SiO<sub>2</sub>, binary oxides, and binary lanthanum oxides, having a dielectric constant of greater than about 20: SN 10/038410, and USPN 6620713.


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Patricia (Patty) George whose telephone number is (571)272-5955. The examiner can normally be reached on weekdays between 7:00am and 4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nadine Norton can be reached on (571)272-1465. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1765

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



PAG  
0306

Patricia A George  
Examiner  
Art Unit 1765

NADINE G. NORTON  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

